



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,535	08/04/2000	Eric Edwards	080398.P368	1757
7590 09/16/2008				
Sheryl Sue Holloway				
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP				
12400 Wilshire Boulevard				
7th Floor				
Los Angeles, CA 90025				
EXAMINER				
KE, PENG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/632,535

Applicant(s)

EDWARDS ET AL.

Examiner

SIMON KE

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7-24, 27-28, and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7-24, 27-28, and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/3/08.

Claims 1, 3 –5, 7-24, 27 – 28, and 30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 22, and 28 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 7/3/08, claims 1, 9, and 14 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663 in view of Hanson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,457,045, further in view of Fette et al. US Patent No. 6,052,600 further in view of Lang et al. US Patent No. 5,867,799 further in view Ludwig US Patent No. 6,437,818.

As per claim 14, Dabney et al. teach a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions to cause a server computer to perform a method comprising:

receiving a concept for a story (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65; the examiner interprets news story data as a story concept);

receiving content related to an element in a concept for a story from one of a plurality of collaborators coupled to the server computer (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 12);

receiving a decision on the content from an editor, the editor being chosen from the group consisting of the one or more editor, at least one of the plurality of collaborators and an originator of the concept (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 3 and column 6, lines 3 – 12); and

including the content in the story if the decision of the editor is to approve the content (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 12; it is inherent that the content is included in the story after being approved by the news editors).

However, Dabney fails to teach the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators.

Hanson teaches the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators. (column 2, lines 64 –column 3, lines 48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hanson with the method of Dabney et al. in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

However, both Debney and Hanson fail to teach deleting the content if the multiple collaborators have failed to approve the content.

Fette teaches removing the content that is not approved. (column 9, lines 50-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Fette with the method of Dabney and Hason in order to free up storage space on the server.

However, Dabney Hanson, and Fette fail to teach determine whether the story concept includes content that meets a predetermined criteria set by a party separate from a plurality of collaborators being on-line users supplying the content associated with the concept of the story and deleting the story concept if the content fails to meet the predetermined criteria.

Making the story concept available, if the content meets the predetermined criteria;

Lang teaches filtering information based on the content standard predetermined by a party separate from a plurality of collaborators being on-line users supplying the content associated with the concept of the story. (column 5, lines 1-40, column 18, lines, the process of filtering is the same process of determining whether the information includes the content that meets a predetermined criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lang with the method of Dabney, Hason and Fette in order to filter out information automatically based on the standard set by the users.

However, they fail to teach collaborators submit competing story content related to elements in the story concept and selected story content from the competing story content submitted from each of the multiple collaborators.

Ludwig teaches collaborators submit competing story content related to elements in the story concept and selected story content from the competing story content submitted from each of the multiple collaborators.(see Ludwig, col. 36, lines 45-col. 37, lines 30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's teaching with method of Dabney, Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to allow users share and annotate story concept.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the computer-readable storage medium of claim 14 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach publishing the story online when all content for the concept is approved (see Dabney et al., column 6, line 3 – 12 and lines 20 – 24).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the computer-readable storage medium of claim 14 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach deleting the content if it does not meet pre-determined standards (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 5; it is inherent that the story data is reviewed in accordance with predetermined standards if it is reviewed for approval by news editors and it is inherent that the story data is erased if it is not approved because the story data is stored only if it is approved).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the computer-readable storage medium of claim 14 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach receiving the concept for the story from the originator (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 2).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the computer-readable storage medium of claim 17 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach making the concept available if it meets pre-determined standards (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 5; it is inherent that when the news editors approve the story they are doing so by determining if it meets pre-determined standards).

Claims 19 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Dabney et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663 in view Hanson 6,457,045 in view of Fette U.S. Patent

6,052,600 further in view of Lang et al. US Patent No. 5,867,799 Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 further in view Ludwig US Patent No. 6,437,818 further in view of Mullins, U.S. Patent No. 5,100,154.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 14, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 14 (see rejection above). Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang do not teach determining a reward for one or more of the multiple collaborators. Mullins teaches determining a reward for one or more of the multiple collaborators (see Mullins, column 6, lines 9 –13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 11, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 19 (see rejection above). Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig do not teach wherein the reward is based on online votes from viewer o the story. Mullins teaches wherein determining a reward further comprises: requesting a vote from each viewer of the story; and counting the votes (see Mullins, column 6, lines 1 – 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig in order to facilitate participation and creativity of participants.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 11, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 19 (see rejection above). Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and

Ludwig do not teach wherein the reward is based on a category for the story. Mullins teaches the method wherein the reward is based on a category for the story (see Mullins, column 6, lines 9 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

Claims 1, 3 – 5, 7-10, 22 – 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663 in view of Hanson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,457,045, further in view of Fette et al. US Patent No. 6,052,600 further in view of Lang et al. US Patent No. 5,867,799 further in view of Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702, further in view Ludwig US Patent No. 6,437,818.

As per claim 1, Dabney et al. teaches a computerized method for creating a story by multiple collaborators being on-line users supplying content associated with a story concept comprising:

receiving the story concept for the story (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65; the examiner interprets news story data as a story concept);

making the story concept available for online access by multiple collaborators (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65);

determining if the content from each of the multiple collaborators is approved for the story (see Dabney et al. column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 3); and

creating the story from the content that is approved (see Dabney et al. column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 3).

However, Dabney fails to teach the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators.

Hanson teaches the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple. (column 2, lines 64 –column 3, lines 48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hanson with the method of Dabney et al. in order to create a system for making choices among a group of participants.

However, both Dabney and Hanson fail to teach deleting the content if the received votes have failed to approve the content.

Fette teaches removing the content that is not approved. (column 9, lines 50-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Fette with the method of Dabney and Hanson in order to free up storage space on the server.

However, Dabney Hanson, and Fette fail to teach determine whether the story concept includes content that meets a predetermined criteria set by a party separate from the multiple collaborators and deleting the story concept if the content fails to meet the predetermined criteria.

Making the story concept available, if the content meets the predetermined criteria;

Lang teaches filtering information based on the content standard predetermined by the client or the community. (column 5, lines 1-40, column 18, lines, the process of filtering is the same process of determining whether the information includes the content that meets a predetermined criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lang with the method of Dabney, Hason and Fette in order to filter out information automatically based on the standard set by the users.

However, Dabney, Hason, Fette, and Lang fail to teach including an indication of one or more editors for the story.

Plantz teaches an indication of one or more editor for the story. (see Plantz et al. column 10, lines 15 – 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Plantz et al. with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to notify the editor which work by the authors is complete and which work await editing.

Ludwig teaches collaborators submit competing story content related to elements in the story concept and selected story content from the competing story content submitted from each of the multiple collaborators.(see Ludwig, col. 36, lines 45-col. 37, lines 30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's teaching with method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Plantz in order to allow users share and annotate story concept.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach determining if the content meets pre-determined criteria; and deleting the content if it does not meet the predetermined criteria (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 5; it is inherent that the story data is reviewed in accordance with predetermined standards if it is reviewed for approval by news editors and it is inherent that the story data is erased if it is not approved because the story data is stored only if it is approved).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach the method comprising: publishing the story online for public viewing (see Dabney et al., column 6 lines 7 – 12).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach the method comprising: publishing the story online for private viewing (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 7).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Fette et al. further teaches wherein the content is deleted automatically (see Fette et al., column 9, lines 50 – 56).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach the method wherein the content received from one of the multiple collaborators is of a different type than content received from another one of the multiple collaborators (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 63 – 64).

As per claim 22, Dabney et al. teach a computerized system comprising:

a processor;

a memory coupled to the processor through a system bus;

a computer-readable medium coupled to the processor through the system bus; and

an online collaborative story process executed from the computer-readable medium by the processor to cause the processor to receive a concept for an online story (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65; the examiner interprets news story data as a story concept) and

to post the concept online wherein the concept defines content for the story (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65),

to receive content for an online story from multiple collaborators (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 12),

to receive a decision on the content from an editor (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 12), and

to include the content in the story if the decision is to approve the content (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 12; it is inherent that the content is included in the story after being approved by the news editors).

However, Dabney fails to teach the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators.

Hanson teaches the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators. (column 2, lines 64 –column 3, lines 48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hanson with the method of Dabney et al. in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

However, both Debney and Hanson fail to teach deleting the content if the multiple collaborators have failed to approve the content.

Fette teaches removing the content that is not approved. (column 9, lines 50-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Fette with the method of Dabney and Hason in order to free up storage space on the server.

However, Dabney Hanson, and Fette fail to teach determine whether the story concept includes content that meets a predetermined criteria set by a party separate from the collaborators being online user supplying the content associated with the concept and deleting the story concept if the content fails to meet the predetermined criteria.

Making the story concept available, if the content meets the predetermined criteria;

Lang teaches filtering information based on the content standard predetermined by the client or the community. (column 5, lines 1-40, column 18, lines, the process of filtering is the

same process of determining whether the information includes the content that meets a predetermined criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lang with the method of Dabney, Hason and Fette in order to filter out information automatically based on the standard set by the users.

However, Dabney, Hason, Fette, and Lang fail to teach including an indication of one or more editors for the story.

Plantz teaches an indication of one or more editor for the story. (see Plantz et al. column 10, lines 15 – 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Plantz et al. with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to notify the editor which work by the authors is complete and which work await editing.

Ludwig teaches collaborators submit competing story content related to elements in the story concept and selected story content from the competing story content submitted from each of the multiple collaborators.(see Ludwig, col. 36, lines 45-col. 37, lines 30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's teaching with method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Plantz in order to allow users share and annotate story concept.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the system of claim 22 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach

wherein the online collaborative story process further causes the processor to publish the story online (see Dabney et al., column 12, lines 15 – 18 and column 13, lines 1 - 5).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 22, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the system of claim 22 (see rejection above). Dabney et al. further teach wherein the online collaborative story process further causes the processor to delete the content when the content does not satisfy pre-determined criteria (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 5; it is inherent that the story data is reviewed in accordance with predetermined standards if it is reviewed for approval by news editors and it is inherent that the story data is erased if it is not approved because the story data is stored only if it is approved).

As per claim 28, Dabney et al. teach a networked server system comprising:

means for posting a concept for a story in a story concept area for access by a plurality of collaborators (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 60 – 65 as well as column 13, lines 55 – 59 and column 14, lines 20 – 29)

means for posting content associated with the story concept in a working content area, the content being received from the plurality of collaborators (see Dabney et al., column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 5);

means for voting on the content in the online working content area (see Dabney et al., column 5, lines 3 – 5; the examiner interprets approving content as voting for the content); and

means for publishing the content approved by the means for voting in a published story area to create the story (see Dabney et al., column 6, lines 3 – 12).

However, Dabney fails to teach the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators.

Hanson teaches the approval of the book is based on the votes received online through a wide area network connection from at least a subset of the multiple collaborators. (column 2, lines 64 –column 3, lines 48)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hanson with the method of Dabney et al. in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

However, both Debney and Hanson fail to teach deleting the content if the multiple collaborators have failed to approve the content.

Fette teaches removing the content that is not approved. (column 9, lines 50-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Fette with the method of Dabney and Hason in order to free up storage space on the server.

However, Dabney Hanson, and Fette fail to teach determine whether the story concept includes content that meets a predetermined criteria set by a party separate from the collaborator and deleting the story concept if the content fails to meet the predetermined criteria.

Making the story concept available, if the content meets the predetermined criteria;

Lang teaches filtering information based on the content standard predetermined by the client or the community. (column 5, lines 1-40, column 18, lines, the process of filtering is the

same process of determining whether the information includes the content that meets a predetermined criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lang with the method of Dabney, Hason and Fette in order to filter out information automatically based on the standard set by the users.

However, Dabney, Hason, Fette, and Lang fail to teach including an indication of one or more editors for the story.

Plantz teaches an indication of one or more editor for the story. (see Plantz et al. column 10, lines 15 – 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Plantz et al. with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to notify the editor which work by the authors is complete and which work await editing.

Ludwig teaches collaborators submit competing story content related to elements in the story concept and selected story content from the competing story content submitted from each of the multiple collaborators.(see Ludwig, col. 36, lines 45-col. 37, lines 30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Ludwig's teaching with method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, and Plantz in order to allow users share and annotate story concept.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1. They do not teach notifying the editor when the content is

received and posted for review by the editor. Plantz et al. teach notifying the editor when the content is received and posted for review by the editor. (see Plantz et al. column 10, lines 15 – 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Plantz et al. with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to notify the editor which work by the authors is complete and which work await editing.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach receiving a list of editors for the use including notifying the editors of a receipt of a story concept. Plantz et al. teach receiving a list of editors for the use including notifying the editors of a receipt of a story concept. (see Plantz et al., column 11, lines 24 – 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Plantz et al. with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, and Lang in order to facilitate editor assignment.

Claims 11 – 13, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Dabney et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663 in view of Hanson 6,457,045 in view of Fette U.S. Patent 6,052,600 further in view of Lang et al. US Patent No. 5,867,799 Plantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 further in view of Ludwig US Patent No. 6,437,818 further in view of Mullins, U.S. Patent No. 5,100,154.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach determining a

reward for one or more of the multiple collaborators. Mullins teaches determining a reward for one or more of the multiple collaborators (see Mullins, column 6, lines 9 –13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 11 (see rejection above). They do not teach wherein determining a reward further comprises: requesting a vote from each viewer of the story; and counting the votes. Mullins teaches wherein determining a reward further comprises: requesting a vote from each viewer of the story; and counting the votes (see Mullins, column 6, lines 1 – 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig in order to facilitate participation and creativity of participants.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 11 (see rejection above). They do not teach wherein the reward is based on a category for the story. Mullins teaches the method wherein the reward is based on a category for the story (see Mullins, column 6, lines 9 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig in order to allow users to reward for the quality of a participant's submissions.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 22, Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig teach the method of claim 22 (see rejection above). They do not teach requesting votes from viewers of the story and determining a reward based on votes received in response to the request. Mullins teaches requesting votes from viewers of the story and determining a reward based on votes received in response to the request (see Mullins, column 6, lines 1 – 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mullins with the method of Dabney Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plantz, and Ludwig in order to facilitate participation and creativity of participants.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 28, it is of similar scope to claim 27 and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 3/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument focused on following:

A) Whether the combination of Dabney, Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plant, and Ludwig teaches making the story concept available for online access to enable the multiple collaborators to submit competing story content related to elements in the story concepts?

A) During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, Lang teaches this limitation because it has a filtering process that determining whether the submitted content meets predetermined criteria. (see Lang; col. 5, lines 1-40)

B) Whether the combination of Dabney, Hanson, Fette, Lang, Plant, and Ludwig teaches accepting received competing story content associated with the story concept from the multiple collaborators if the received competing story content meets the predetermined criteria?

B) Ludwig teaches this limitation because it allows multiple collaborators to provide content input related to the discussion concept. (see Ludwig, col. 36, lines 45-col. 37, line 30)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

Peng Ke
Examiner, Art Unit 2174